

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed September 26, 2008. Claims 6-7 were pending in the Application. In the office Action, Claims 6-7 were rejected. In order to expedite prosecution of the present Application, Applicants have amended Claim 6 and have canceled Claim 7. New Claims 8-12 have been added and these new claims depend from Claim 6. Thus, Claims 6, and 8-12 remain pending in the Application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

SECTION 112 REJECTIONS

Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for failure to comply with the enablement requirement due to a lack of description of a processing circuitry used to randomly select a memory location. Claim 7 has been canceled and Claim 6 has been amended. Applicants submit that the rejection is now moot in view of the amendments.

SECTION 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,686,904 ("Bruwer") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,8004,524 to Roesgen ("Roesgen"). Claims 6 and 7 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruwer in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,484,262 to Sullivan ("Sullivan"). In addition, Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruwer in view of Roesgen and Sullivan and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,750,118 to Heitschel ("Heitschel"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Independent Claim 6 recites, in part: "means for generating a multi-bit changeable hopping code, the hopping code being generated by a non-linear function responsive to a plurality of input parameters..."Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed combination of references does not disclose, teach or suggest all claim limitations of amended independent Claim 6. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 6 is patentable over the proposed combination of references.

Claims 8-12 depend from independent Claim 6 and these dependent claims further define the plurality of input parameters to the non-linear function. Applicants submit that Claims 8-12 are allowable over the proposed combination of references.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or to credit any fee overpayment relating to this matter to Deposit Account No. 07-0153.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 24, 2008



Michael A. Rahman
Registration No. 43,872

GARDERE WYNNE SEWELL LLP
1601 Elm Street, Suite 3000
Dallas, Texas 75201-4761
Phone (214) 999-4992
Fax (214) 999-3992